

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/764,538	01/27/2004	Kazunari Oyama	02910.000110.	9614	
5514 FITZPATRICE	7590 03/14/200 K CELLA HARPER &	EXAMINER			
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			CHANG, KENT WU		
NEW YORK,	NY 10112		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2629			
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MC	PHTMC	03/14/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Applie	cation No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/76	4,538	OYAMA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary			iner	Art Unit				
			Chang	2629				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communi or Reply	cation appears or	the cover sheet	with the correspondence ac	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any i	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M. sions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm period for reply is specified above, the maximum stare to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months are departed term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In runication. tutory period will apply a will, by statute, cause the	THIS COMMU! no event, however, may nd will expire SIX (6) M e application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·			
Status					•			
1)[]	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <i>05 January</i> :	2007.					
		b)⊠ This action			·			
3)	·							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5,6,10-18 and 20-30</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>5,6,10-18 and 20-30</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	_							
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restric	tion and/or election	on requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:		r b) objected t	o by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any object		· ·	•				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	the correction is re	quired if the drawi	ng(s) is objected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner	. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim f	or foreign priority	under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a)[All b) Some * c) None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority of2. Certified copies of the priority of			A . P . P . A1				
	 Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internation 			en received in this National	Stage			
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action	•	` ''	nt received				
			oranica copico n					
Attachment	(s)							
1) 🔲 Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview	v Summary (PTO-413)				
2) 🔲 Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P	ГО-948)	Paper N	o(s)/Mail Date				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Other:	f Informal Patent Application				

Application/Control Number: 10/764,538

Art Unit: 2629

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/4/06 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Application/Control Number: 10/764,538

Art Unit: 2629

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Page 3

5. Claims 5, 6, 10-18 and 20-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura et al (US2002/0031972) or Dean et al (US Patent No. 6,645,028).

Kitamura teaches a method of driving and the manufacturing method of an electron-emitting devices formed on a substrate, in each of which an electron-emitting member including a plurality of carbon fibers is capable of emitting electrons when a driving voltage is applied between a cathode electrode on which the electron-emitting member is formed and a counter electrode disposed in opposition to the cathode electrode. Dean teaches a method of driving and the manufacturing method of an electron-emitting devices formed on a substrate, in each of which an electron-emitting member including a plurality of carbon fibers is capable of emitting electrons when a driving voltage is applied between a cathode electrode on which the electron-emitting member is formed and a counter electrode disposed in opposition to the cathode electrode. Both devices of Kitamura and Dean include a voltage operating range having

Art Unit: 2629

a maximum applied voltage level and a minimum applied voltage level within which the display device can be driven (such as the highest and lowest applied voltage as shown in Figures 13 and 14 in the reference of Kitamura, or the highest and lowest applied voltage as shown in Figure 1 in the reference of Dean). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use any voltage having a level within the operating range including the maximum applied voltage to drive the display since any voltage within that range performs equally well in generating an image. It would also have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to test the device with the maximum applied voltage and minimum applied voltage such as during manufacturing time or any time the user wants to examine the functionality of the device. In other words, it would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply a voltage across a voltage level above which an absolute value of an inclination in F-N plots of an electron-emitting characteristic of the electron-emitting member decreases, shifting the F-N plot of the electron-emitting characteristic of the first electron-emitting member as a result of increasing the applying voltage that is applied between the counter electrode and the first cathode electrode having the first electron-emitting member in the cathode electrodes, across the voltage above which the absolute value of the inclination in the F-N plot of the electron-emitting characteristic of the first electron-emitting member decreases; and therefore would reduce a difference of (i) an electron-emitting characteristic of a second electronemitting member being operative to emit a relatively greater number of electrons when a predetermined voltage is applied between a second cathode electrode having the

Art Unit: 2629

second electron-emitting member in the cathode electrodes and the counter electrode and (ii) the electron-emitting characteristic of the first electron-emitting member being operative-to emit a relative lesser number of electrons when the predetermined voltage is applied between the first cathode electrode and the counter electrode since such a voltage level is within the operating range and applying the maximum voltage would cause the reduction of the difference as stated above. The fact that a high voltage (a voltage is less than or equal to the maximum applied voltage) would cause the shifting of the F-N plot and the reduction of the difference as stated above is the inherent property of a FED, as admitted by applicant in the specification. Furthermore, the electron-emitting device of Kitamura includes a plurality of carbon fibers selected from among a plurality of carbon nanotubes, a plurality of graphite nanofibers and a mixed plurality of carbon nanotubes and graphite nanofibers (Paragraph 0041) and the electron-emitting device of Dean includes a plurality of carbon fibers selected from among a plurality of carbon nanotubes, a plurality of graphite nanofibers and a mixed plurality of carbon nanotubes and graphite nanofibers (see column 2 lines 15-22).

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kent Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-7667. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz, can be reached at 571-272-3638.

Art Unit: 2629

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

571-273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kent Chang Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2629

kc 3/11/07